



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,744	08/24/2006	Devan Govender	05-713	6074
20306 7590 04/04/2008 MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER LOPEZ, ELDRED ISAAC				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/550,744

Applicant(s)

GOVENDER ET AL.

Examiner

ELDRED I. LOPEZ

Art Unit

4156

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11-15, 17-26, 28-32 and 34-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11-15, 17-26, 28-32 and 34-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing Review (PTO-848)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 19 March 2007, 11 April 2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9, 11-15, 17-26, 28-32, 34-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acres (U.S. 6712697). Acres discloses a system for administering promotions associated with a wagering application in which a player purchases credit to make wagers on a game of chance (Col 4, Lines 35-55). Acres discloses:

a credit administration facility operable to maintain a credit account for the player wherein the credit administration facility is operable to automatically determine the balance of the credit account of the player as a function of any credit purchases made by the player, wagers made by the player and their corresponding payouts, and any a priori promotion credit awarded to the player (Col 6, Lines 62-67; Col 7, Lines 1-7), the credit administration facility being instructable to display the balance of the credit account to the player on a display means (Figure 2; Col 7, Lines 1-7), wherein the credit administration facility is further operable to maintain a non cashable sub account corresponding to a portion of the player's credit account that is not redeemable for monetary value

and to maintain at least on play through sub account for the player (Col 9, Lines 63-67; Col 10, Lines 1-9).

Acres also discloses:

Regarding claim 11, 28, in which the credit administration facility is instructable to display a balance of the non cashable sub account to the player on the display means (Figure 2; Col 7, Lines 3-7).

Regarding claim 12, 29, in which the credit administration facility detects the award of a priori promotion credit to the player, the priori promotion credit having a corresponding quantum and a corresponding play through multiplier (Col 7, Lines 14-26; Col 8, Lines 1-23). The credit administration facility gives a bonus in form of credit to the account credits. Since the account credits must be wagered before they are cashed out, though not specifically cited, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a play through multiplier or requirement is inherent.

Regarding claims 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42 in which the credit administration facility increments a balance of the player's non cashable sub account by the quantum of the priori promotion credit (Figure 2; Col 7, Lines 3-7), and in which the at least on play through sub account for the player includes a play through sub account and a play through achieved sub account (Col 9, Lines 63-67; Col 10, Lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that although the account credit is not split into further sub

accounts, it is functionally equivalent as there is no further benefit of the sub accounts other than to keep track of the non cashable credits.

Regarding claim 15, 32, in which the credit administration facility is instructable to display a balance of the at least one play through sub account to the player on the display means (Figure 2; Col 7, Lines 3-7).

Regarding claim 20, 37, in which the credit administration facility debits the balance of the player's credit account and the balance of the non cashable sub account with the size of the wager and credits these balances with a payout arising from the wager if successful (Col 6, Lines 62-67; Lines 7, Lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 21, 38, in which the credit account facility clears the balances of the play through required the play through achieved sub accounts when the size of the wager exceeds the balance of the non cashable sub account. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the balance of the account credit would be cleared if the wager exceeds the balance since the account credit is debited (Col 6, Lines 62-67; Lines 7, Lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 22, 39, in which the credit administration facility enables the player to request a cash out at any time (Col 4, Lines 57-59).

Regarding claim 23, 40, in which the credit administration facility automatically determines, in response to the player's cash out request, a balance of the player credit account that is redeemable for monetary value and displays the redeemable balance to the player on the display means (Figure 2; Col 4, Lines 60-67).

3. Claims 45-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acres (U.S. 6712697), and further in view of Brosnan et al (U.S. 7063617). Acres discloses all elements as described above, however Acres seems to lack disclosing a posteriori credit.

4. Brosnan teaches a posteriori credit (Col 11, Lines 65-67; Col 12, Lines 1-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the elements of Acres and Brosnan. One would be motivated to do so to provide better excitement and gameplay to the player. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have provided a device to provide more excitement to a player by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results.

5. Acres also discloses:

Regarding claims 46, 51, wherein winnings arising from wagers made with the any a priori promotion credit contribute to the cashable portion when the first play through requirement is met (Col 7, Lines 14-26; Col 8, Lines 1-23).

Regarding claims 47, 52, wherein the any a priori promotion credit does not contribute to the cashable portion at any time (Col 7, Lines 14-26).

Regarding claim 48, 53, wherein the any a priori promotion credit progressively contributes to the cashable portion as a function of wagers made by the player on house edge services (Col 7, Lines 14-26).

Art Unit: 3725

6. Regarding claims 49 and 54, Bronsan teaches a posteriori promotion credit and Acres discloses because these credits must be wagered before they are cashed out, though not specifically cited, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a play through multiplier or requirement is inherent.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jorash et al (U.S. 6379248).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELDRED I. LOPEZ whose telephone number is (571)270-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Isabella can be reached on (571) 272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Eldred Lopez
Patent Examiner

/Dmitry Suhol/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3725

/